PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

	RNATIONAL SEAF	TOTAL ABITA	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		DCT
To:			·	PCT	
	•				
see form PCT/ISA/220				WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43 <i>bis.</i> 1)	
				Date of mailing	
				(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)	
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220				FOR FURTHER ACTION	
	•			See paragraph 2 belo	
International application No. PCT/IB2005/002266			International filing date (25.07.2005	day/montn/year)	Priority date (day/month/year) 05.08.2004
		sification (IPC) or I	l both national classification	and IPC	I
F04D29/38					
Applicant SPAL AUTOMOTIVE S.R.L.					
1.	This opinion co	entains indication	ons relating to the fol	lowing items:	
	☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion☒ Box No. II Priority				
	☑ Box No. II Priority☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to a				
	☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention			ard to novelty, inventiv	ve step and industrial applicability
	Box No. V	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1			novelty, inventive step or industrial
applicability; citations and explanations supporting such stat ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application				ement	
				nligation	
Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application					
2. FURTHER ACTION					
If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.					
					However, this does not apply where chosen IPEA has notifed the
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.					
For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.					
3.	3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.				
٠					
			11.5		
Nan	ne and mailing addre	ss of the ISA:		Authorized Officer	



European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Di Giorgio, F

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7289



10/570805 IAP9Rec'd PCT/PTO n6 MAR 2006

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/IB2005/002266

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

1-20

No:

Claims

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

1-20

No:

Claims

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-20

No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

which the chord length increases gradually from the inner end to the outer end of the blade, "thereby allowing the relatively high rotational speed to be used effectively". This furthermore "enhances the amount of airflow and improves the efficiencies of the fan". In D1 however the blade profile has a non negligible chamber (see fig.3, D1) which results in a appreciable difference between the chord length and the claimed centre line length.

D2 discloses a fan, which, although failing to suggest blades having respectively convex trailing and concave leading edges, but only forward or backward swept blades, it suggest that the chord length should increase with the radius increase (see fig. 2, D2). Further details and chord length ranges and also suggested. The adimensional values of said ranges are anyway much bigger than what claimed in the present application.

Therefore the skilled man would not find any indication to combine the known fans and to modify them with inventive considerations, in order to arrive at the claimed subject-matter.

Therefore the solution to the technical problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT).

- 4. Claims 2-20 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.
- 5. The subject-matter of the claims is considered to be industrially applicable (Art. 33(4) PCT).
- 6. Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1(a)(ii) PCT, the relevant background art disclosed in the documents D1 and D2 is not mentioned in the description, nor are these documents identified therein.